

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTION, AND TENURE
Criteria and Procedures for the:
School of Teaching and Learning (EDU T&L)
in the
College of Education and Human Ecology

First Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: May 1997

Second Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: December 1998

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): December 20, 1998

Third Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: July 1999

Reaffirmed by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: June, 2001

Fourth Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: July 2002

Modifications in response to College review: February 2003

Modifications in response to OAA review: April 2003

Approved by Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): May 5, 2003

Fifth Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: May 19, 2004

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): July 13, 2004

Sixth Draft Approved by School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: March 30, 2005

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): May 22, 2006

Seventh Draft Approved by the School of Teaching & Learning Faculty: December 7, 2007

Modifications in response to OAA review: September 2008

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): October 9, 2008

Eighth Draft Approved by the School of Teaching and Learning Faculty: February 11, 2011

Approved by the Office of Academic Affairs (OAA): July 15, 2011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. PREAMBLE.....	4
2. SCHOOL MISSION.....	5
3. APPOINTMENTS.....	7
3.1 Criteria.....	8
3.12 Instructor	8
3.13 Assistant Professor.....	9
3.14 Associate Professor.....	9
3.15 Professor	9
3.16 Auxiliary Faculty.....	9
3.161 Definitions.....	9
3.162 Appointment.....	9
3.163 Reappointment.....	9
3.17 Courtesy Appointments.....	10
3.2 Appointment Procedures.....	10
3.21 Tenure Track Faculty.....	10
3.22 Auxiliary Faculty.....	12
3.23 Courtesy Appointments.....	12
3.24 Notice of Nonrenewal.....	12
4. ANNUAL REVIEWS.....	13
4.1 Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty.....	14
4.11 Fourth-Year Review.....	18
4.12 Exclusion from Probationary Period.....	18
4.2 Procedures: Tenured faculty.....	19
5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS.....	21
5.1 Criteria.....	21
5.2 Procedures.....	21
5.3 Documentation.....	22
6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEW.....	22
6.1 Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure.....	22
6.12 Teaching.....	24
6.121 Components of Teaching.....	24
6.122 General Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching.....	25
6.123 Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching.....	27
6.13 Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities.....	27
6.131 Components of Research, Creative or Other Scholarly Activities.....	28
6.132 Evaluation of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities.....	29
6.133 Evidence for the Evaluation of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities.....	30
6.14 Service.....	31
6.141 Components of Service.....	31
6.2 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure.....	31
6.3 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor with Tenure.....	32
6.4 Criteria: Regional Campus Faculty.....	32
6.5 Procedures.....	33
6.51 Composition and Policy: T&L Personnel Committee.....	35

6.512 Terms of Service	35
6.513 Election of Committee Chairperson and Procedures Oversight Designee	36
6.514 Quorum	36
6.515 Conflict of Interest	37
6.52 Mechanics of the Promotion and Tenure Process.....	37
6.521 Sources and Responsibility for Gathering Data	37
6.521a Book One and Materials Preceding Book One	37
6.521b Book Two	38
6.521c Procurement of Letters of Evaluation	39
6.521d Preparation of Dossiers	41
6.521e Submission of Dossiers.....	42
6.521f Responsibility for Recommendations	43
6.521g Responsibility for Providing Feedback	44
6.53 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty Members	45
6.6 Documentation	46
6.61 Teaching	46
6.62 Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities	47
6.63 Service.....	47
7. APPEALS	47
8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS	48

1. PREAMBLE

The process of appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure at the University lies at the heart of the effort to ensure the ongoing excellence of the School of Teaching and Learning and the College of Education and Human Ecology. The purpose of this document is to develop criteria and procedures for making decisions about these issues. The goal is to use fair and just processes to discern the nature of an individual's contributions to the School, the College, the University, and the Community.

This document is a supplement to Chapter 6 of the Rules of the University Faculty (*Additional Rules Concerning Faculty Appointments, Re-appointments, Promotion and Tenure*), the Office of Academic Affairs procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews, and any additional policies established by the College of Education and Human Ecology and the University. Should those rules and policies change, the School shall follow those new rules and policies until such time as it can update this document to reflect the changes. In addition, this document must be reviewed, and either reaffirmed or revised, at least every four years on appointment or reappointment of the School Director.

This document must be approved by the Dean of the College and the Provost of the University before it can be implemented. It sets forth the School's mission and, in the context of that mission and the missions of the College and University, its criteria and procedures for faculty appointments, and its criteria and procedures for faculty promotion, tenure and rewards including salary increases. In approving this document, the Dean and Provost accept the mission and criteria of the School and delegate to it the responsibility to apply high standards in evaluating continuing faculty and candidates for positions in relation to its mission and criteria.

The general policies and procedures in this document pertain to personnel on the Columbus campus and all Regional Campuses, unless differences are otherwise specified.

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in the following Faculty Rule:

3335-47-01 General considerations.

(A) Peer review provides the foundation for decisions regarding faculty appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure (except when the provisions of rule 3335-47-03 (H) are invoked). Peers are those faculty who can be expected to be most knowledgeable regarding an individual's qualifications and performance--normally tenure initiating unit colleagues. Because of the centrality of peer review to these review processes, faculty vested with responsibility for providing peer review have an obligation to participate fully and knowledgeably in review processes, to exercise the standards established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline, and to make negative recommendations when these are warranted to maintain and improve the

quality of the faculty. Recommendations by the faculty vested with the responsibility for providing peer review will be accepted unless they are not supported by the evidence presented regarding how the candidate meets the standards established in faculty rule 3335-47-02 and other standards specific to the academic unit and discipline. When, for the reasons just stated, a decision regarding faculty appointment, re-appointment, or promotion and tenure differs from the recommendation of the faculty, the administrator or body making that decision will communicate to the faculty body that made the recommendation, the reasons that the recommendation was judged not to be supported by the evidence. [Note: In T&L, the Administrator or body making the above decision will provide, in writing, the reasons for the recommendation. Furthermore, recommendations regarding faculty appointment, re-appointment, or promotion and tenure in the School of Teaching and Learning are expected to demonstrate alignment between the criteria of the evidence, the evidence itself, and the recommendation and/or vote].

(B) In accordance with a policy of equality of opportunity, decisions concerning appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure shall be free of discrimination as to race, creed, religion, national origin, age, sex, disability, Vietnam-era veteran status, or sexual orientation.

Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (E) provides the opportunity for academic units to petition for policies and procedures differing from those set forth in the rules. Petitions must explain why the modification is in the best interest both of the academic unit and the University. All such petitions must be approved by the Dean of the College and then be reviewed by the Rules Committee of the University Senate. The advisory committee will recommend approval or disapproval to the Provost, who will make the final decision.

2. SCHOOL MISSION

The School of Teaching and Learning, through its scholarly activities and scholarly **products (OAA's traditional tripartite domains of Teaching; Research, Creative, and Other Scholarly Activities; and Service)**, seeks to provide exemplary leadership to its constituencies both within and beyond traditional school settings. The School supports, for example, scholarship in all its manifestations, professional practice, and professional development of its faculty members as they engage in these endeavors.

A perspective on this Mission is provided by the following statements:

- The purpose of the School of Teaching and Learning is to promote scholarly activities among its students and faculty pertaining to the understanding of teaching and learning processes and the developing of effective forms of education for beginning and advanced classroom teachers as well as educational researchers. Scholarly activities include formal and informal inquiry/research, the pursuit of effective teaching methods and content in the courses offered by the School, and collaborative work with colleagues in the School as

well as the establishment of collaborative partnerships both outside the School and outside the University.

- The focus of the School of Teaching and Learning is the effective preparation and continued education of teachers such that these teachers can respond to the needs of all learners. The School of Teaching and Learning seeks to advocate equitably on behalf of all learners. This focus is reflected in the university classrooms not only as a subject matter but also in terms of the processes of learning supported by the college classroom. One of the priorities of the School of Teaching and Learning is to support this focus through the maintenance of constructive working relationships among all people who are a part of the School: faculty, staff, students, and community stakeholders.
- The world of the twenty-first century is a world of many kinds of people. It is a priority of the School to both recruit and to maintain that kind of diversity across faculty, staff, and students. This priority requires us to all develop the ability to work in groups where values and perspectives may differ significantly across participants.

OAA utilizes the traditional tripartite domains: Teaching; Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities; and Service for promotion and tenure documents. The faculty in the School of Teaching and Learning perceive that there is little separation among these three areas, especially between the Teaching and Research areas. That is, faculty subscribe to the notion that Teaching and Service are or can also be scholarly activities and may, therefore, **result in 'products' that are scholarly, and some of which** may be subjected to rigorous peer review as is customarily expected of products that are typically included in the OAA domain of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities.

In this document, the School of Teaching and Learning has adopted the OAA terms— Teaching ; Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities; and Service—with the intent to define scholarship as broadly as possible. To address these issues and to ensure that information can be documented in the OAA domains for promotion and/or tenure, the School refers to the work of faculty as consisting broadly of scholarly activities and scholarly and creative products.

Scholarly activities refer to all rigorous, serious, reflective activities of the faculty in the traditional tripartite domain. It is not difficult to provide examples for all three areas, specifically Teaching and Service. In Teaching, a faculty member may engage in course preparation activities (e.g., library research; upgrading content; incorporating the findings of research studies) or engage in problem-solving activities (e.g., ways to increase a student's understanding in the classrooms, in schools, and in their own teaching on campus). In the Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities domain, faculty may engage in grant development, conduct research projects, and participate in collaborative projects with faculty either locally, nationally, or internationally. In the Service domain, a faculty member may be a member of the review board of a refereed journal or participate on a personnel committee addressing promotion and tenure decisions. The examples provided here are not restrictive, **but are intended to illustrate the 'kind' of activity that may be considered 'scholarly' in each of the three OAA domains.**

In the Research domain, much of the emphasis has been placed on what should more appropriately be labeled 'scholarly products'-that is, journal articles, books, monographs, presentations, proposals, and so on. These products obviously reflect intense, serious scholarly activity for their development.

In the School of Teaching and Learning, scholarly activities in the tripartite domain can lead to the development and submission of scholarly products (or works). At issue here is the appropriate documentation of 'products' in the OAA area--Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities--for promotion and/or tenure purposes. For this OAA 'domain', scholarly works must be subjected to a rigorous level of review or evaluation. Levels of review as described in this APT document may reflect perceived rigor in the process of review. Regardless, scholarly and creative works may include the traditional products (e.g., journal articles, scholarly books, grant proposals, etc.). Also included are products developed for specific university courses, classes, seminars, or practica (e.g., textbooks, websites, technology-infused materials, teaching manuals, audiotapes, videotapes, etc.). This latter group of products, which support the teaching function, can be included in the 'Research, Creative or Other Scholarly Activities domain' if (1) they are evaluated by external peers to be innovative, research-based, and have an impact on the subject matter taught and (2) have been adopted or used by individuals in other universities. Otherwise, this group of products should be documented in the Instruction domain (as should other scholarly activities related to teaching).

3. APPOINTMENTS

The faculty and the administration are bound by the principles articulated in the following Faculty Rule:

3335-47-02 Criteria for appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure.

- (A) Each tenure initiating unit is responsible for establishing criteria for appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure that are consistent with this mission and for ensuring that every faculty appointment, re-appointment, and promotion and tenure recommendation is consistent with this mission.
- (B) Appointment decisions for regular faculty positions, as defined in rule 3335-5-19 of the Administrative Code, must be based on criteria that reflect strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. A minimum requirement for appointment at or promotion to the rank of assistant professor or a higher rank is an earned doctorate or other terminal degree in the relevant field of study or possession of equivalent experience. Appointments at the rank of instructor should normally only be made when the offered appointment is that of assistant professor but the appointee has not completed the required terminal degree at the onset of the appointment.

3335-47-03 Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty

(B) Length of probationary period.

(1) An appointment as professor or associate professor will generally entail tenure. However, a probationary period not to exceed four years may be granted by the office of academic affairs upon petition of the tenure initiating unit and college. For the petition to be approved, a compelling rationale must be provided regarding why appointment at a senior rank is appropriate but tenure is not. All appointments to the rank of associate professor or professor require prior approval of the executive vice president and provost.

An appointment to the rank of instructor is always probationary and may not exceed three years. An instructor must be approved for promotion to assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year. When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the office of academic affairs through the Dean of the college so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

An appointment to the rank of assistant professor is always probationary and may not exceed six years, including prior service credit. An assistant professor is reviewed for promotion and tenure no later than the sixth year of appointment as an assistant professor and informed by the end of the sixth year as to whether promotion and tenure will be granted at the beginning of the seventh year.

3.1 Criteria

3.12 Instructor

Appointment to the rank of instructor will ordinarily only be made when the candidate meets the criteria for appointment as an assistant professor, but has not completed the doctoral degree at the time of appointment. Such individuals must have completed this degree and have been promoted to the rank of assistant professor by the beginning of the third year of appointment or the appointment will not be renewed beyond the end of the third year.

When an instructor is promoted to the rank of assistant professor, prior service credit will be granted for time spent as an instructor unless the faculty member indicates in writing at the time of the promotion that he or she does not wish such credit. This written request must be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs through the Dean of the College so that tenure records may be adjusted accordingly.

3.13 Assistant Professor

For appointment to the rank of assistant professor, the candidate must possess an earned doctoral degree and demonstrate strong potential to attain tenure and advance through the faculty ranks. Examples of evidence demonstrating this potential include documentation of experience after acquiring the doctoral degree; specifically in areas as described in the criteria for promotion and/or tenure in this document (e.g., see Section 6). Strong letters of support **from recognized scholars are encouraged with specific remarks on the candidate's** potential in teaching, research, creative, or other scholarly activities, and service.

3.14 Associate Professor

For appointment to the rank of associate professor, the candidate must demonstrate competence equivalent to that required for advancement to this rank as described in Section 6 of this document.

3.15 Professor

For appointment to the rank of professor, the candidate must demonstrate competence equivalent to that required for advancement to this rank as described in Section 6 of this document.

3.16 Auxiliary Faculty

Auxiliary faculty appointments may be made for not more than one year at a time and thus require formal annual renewal if they are to be continued.

3.161 Definitions

Compensated auxiliary faculty may include full-time or part-time lecturers and senior lecturers, instructors, assistant/associate/full professors employed for less than 50% time, and visiting faculty, whose annual appointments may not exceed three continuous years. *No-salary auxiliary faculty* may include adjunct faculty, whose principal employment is not at OSU, instructors and assistant/associate/full professors employed at 0% time.

3.162 Appointment

To be appointed to either a compensated or no-salary auxiliary faculty rank, a candidate must provide evidence that he or she has the potential to make a necessary and substantial contribution to one or more aspects of the mission of the School. Examples of evidence demonstrating this potential may include documentation of an appropriate educational background, scholarly presentations and publications, appropriate and successful teaching and/or research, creative, or other scholarly activities and/or service experience, and letters of support from appropriate referees. In particular, appointees to the ranks of adjunct or visiting instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors shall meet the criteria for appointment to the corresponding regular faculty ranks.

3.163 Reappointment

To be reappointed to a compensated or no-salary auxiliary faculty rank, a candidate must provide evidence of having made a substantial and appropriate contribution to the mission of the School. Examples of such evidence may include positive reviews of classroom teaching or supervision, letters of support from T&L collaborators on research projects, and evidence of contributions to service initiatives of the School. The decision to reappoint is made by the School Director after consultation with the School Executive Committee, and appropriate faculty, and those faculty and others believed most knowledgeable about the **candidate's performance and the need for further services by the candidate.**

3.17 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments are no-salary joint appointments for regular faculty employed by other tenure-initiating units at OSU. Courtesy appointments do not require formal annual renewal.

A candidate for a courtesy appointment must provide evidence of potential to contribute substantially to one or more aspects of the mission of the School. Evidence of this potential will usually include a curriculum vita of the candidate and a letter of support from one or more appropriate faculty and after consultation with the School Executive Committee.

Renewal of courtesy appointments will require evidence that the appointee has established a pattern of ongoing contributions to the mission of the School. Such evidence will include a current curriculum vita, a letter from the appointee documenting involvement in School activities, and a supporting letter from one or more appropriate faculty and after consultation with the School Executive Committee.

3.2 Appointment Procedures

It is the mission of the University, College of Education and Human Ecology, and the School of Teaching and Learning to hire highly qualified faculty, who have the potential to engage in commendable scholarly activities (i.e., across all OAA domains) and to produce exemplary scholarly products (i.e., as documented in Research, Creative, and Other Scholarly Activities). Using the APT document as its guidelines, the School is committed to examine all promotion and/or tenure cases in a rigorous and fair manner.

The School of Teaching and Learning strives to create an atmosphere that is conducive and facilitative to **probationary and tenured faculty's pursuit of promotion and/or tenure. In fact, the School has the expectation** that all of its faculty should be provided adequate support so that they can proceed successfully through the promotion and/or tenure ranks.

3.21 Tenure Track Faculty

The appointment procedures for employing tenure-track faculty shall be consistent with the most current procedures established by the Office of Academic Affairs and the College. A national search and vigorous efforts to ensure a diverse pool of highly qualified candidates are required.

A search committee will be appointed by the Dean of the College in consultation with the Director of T&L. While the majority of the faculty membership shall consist of T&L faculty, it will include at least one faculty member from another tenure-initiating unit in the College or University. Recommendations from the Director will be based on the participation of the School faculty. The Chair of the search committee shall be a faculty member in T&L. Students, staff members, and other individuals may be involved as deemed appropriate; however, at least one representative of these groups must come from T&L.

In the case of a tenure-track position on a Regional Campus, the Regional Campus Dean has primary responsibility for determining the need for a position and the position description, but should consult with and seek agreement with the Director of T&L and the Dean of the College on the Columbus Campus. The Director of the School and the Regional Campus Dean shall agree on a single search committee for the position consisting of members of both campuses. The majority of the search committee members shall be comprised of Regional Campus faculty of T&L. At least one committee member should be affiliated with the School of Teaching and Learning (T&L) on the Columbus campus. Students, staff members, and other individuals may be involved as deemed appropriate.

The search process shall include one or more public presentations by the candidates, one or more opportunities for interested faculty, students, and staff (as appropriate) to meet individually or in small groups with these candidates, and establishment of a formal mechanism whereby, following the completion of on-campus interviews, faculty, students, and staff (as appropriate) can provide advice to the search committee and to the School Director (or Regional Dean for regional faculty) concerning the perceived merits of the candidates interviewed. Part of this mechanism shall include an opportunity to recommend that the search be extended to find a more suitable candidate, even if this means that the position will remain unfilled for the next academic year.

Regional candidates should, at a minimum be interviewed by the Regional Campus Dean, the Director of T&L, the Associate Dean for Faculty of the College of Education and Human Ecology, and the search committee. Candidates will be evaluated on both the Regional and Columbus Campuses.

For a Columbus faculty candidate, the Director shall make a recommendation to the Dean, giving substantial weight to feedback from the faculty of the School of Teaching and Learning and to the report of the Search Committee. For the Regional Campus candidate, a recommendation to offer a position requires agreement on the part of the Director of T&L and of the Regional Campus Dean, who is responsible for determining the procedures on the Regional Campus. A recommendation to hire should give substantial weight to the recommendation of the education faculty on the Regional Campus. Negotiations with a candidate should not begin without such agreement and a letter of offer must be signed by the Director of Teaching and Learning and the Dean of the Regional Campus. On all

campuses, issues of prior service credit shall be negotiated between the candidate and the person responsible for recommending the hire prior to a final offer and should be reflected in writing in the letter of offer.

All offers at the associate professor and professor ranks, with or without tenure, and all offers of prior service credit require the prior approval of the Office of Academic Affairs. Offers to foreign nationals require prior consultation with the Office of International Education. (OAA Guidelines)

3.22 Auxiliary Faculty

Appointment of auxiliary faculty shall be initiated by the School Director after consultation with appropriate faculty, and the School Executive Committee. There must be evidence that the candidate has the potential to make the appropriate contribution(s) to the mission of the School. The Director shall communicate to the entire School Faculty the nature of the contributions expected by such appointees and shall request feedback concerning the extent to which such contributions are met. The roles of Adjunct Faculty relative to teaching and service (e.g., on graduate students' committees) shall be subject to Graduate School policies and those that are developed by the School of Teaching and Learning.

Renewal of appointments of auxiliary faculty shall be initiated by the Director after consultation with appropriate faculty and the School Executive Committee, staff and students.

3.23 Courtesy Appointments

Courtesy appointments shall be initiated by the School Director after consultation with the appropriate faculty and School Executive Committee. There must be evidence that the candidate has the potential to make the appropriate contribution(s) to the mission of the School. The Director shall communicate to the entire School Faculty the nature of the contributions expected by such appointees and shall request feedback concerning the extent to which such contributions are met.

Renewal of courtesy appointments will require evidence that the appointee has established a pattern of substantial ongoing contributions to the mission of the School. Such evidence will include a current curriculum vita, a letter from the appointee documenting involvement in School activities, and a supporting letter from appropriate faculty after consultation with the School Executive Committee.

3.24 Notice of Nonrenewal

3335-47-08 *Standards of notice*

(A) In cases of nonrenewal of an appointment to a regular faculty rank, the university will, insofar as possible, observe the following standards of notice:

- (1) Not later than March first of the first academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if a one-year appointment expires during an academic year, at least three months in advance of its expiration;
 - (2) Not later than December fifteenth of the second academic year of probationary service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or if an appointment expires during the second academic year, at least six months in advance of its expiration; and
 - (3) At least twelve months before the expiration of an appointment after two or more years in the institution.
- (B) These standards of notice need not apply in cases of termination for cause.
- (C) In the event of a decision resulting in nonrenewal, the chair shall notify the faculty member in writing of that decision and the reasons for it.
- (D) Decisions regarding renewal of members of the auxiliary faculty (adjunct, clinical, visiting titles, or lecturers) are made annually in accordance with criteria and procedures of the appointing instructional unit and in accordance with university policies relative to auxiliary faculty

4. ANNUAL REVIEWS

At the beginning of each calendar year, the Director provides each faculty member with a prototype of the Annual Report on which each faculty member shall list her/his activities for the previous calendar year from January 1st to December 31st and goals, including a scholarship plan, for the next calendar year. The information documented on the Annual Report shall be the basis on which faculty members are evaluated yearly. All faculty shall follow the format for the dossier specified in the Ed T&L APT document for Book One, which is aligned with the OAA promotion and tenure document.

Every annual review of a probationary faculty member must be cumulative, that is, taking **into consideration the faculty's member past performance and indicating directions for future performance**, if necessary. This procedure should minimize situations that seem to **reflect a 'sudden' change in probationary faculty member's progress, for example, in the case where reviews have been totally positive, and the very next review is negative. This does not negate the possibility of a 'good' or 'bad' performance year; however, the annual review should present the current evaluation within the context of previous evaluations, if available, to provide an overall context of the faculty member's progress.**

Untenured faculty and associate professors considering full professor review are encouraged to collect materials for Book Two annually. The Annual Report must also be considered relative to the current workload policy adopted by the School of Teaching and

Learning and the Regional Campus as discussed in the School and/or Campus Pattern of Administration. Information on matters such as academic citizenship as defined and **described in the Faculty Workload policy in the School's Pattern of Administration** [i.e., participating in and contributing to the program, mission, and on-going functions of the School, College, and University] and collaboration activities shall be sought by the Director. In the Annual Report, the information may be reported in the service category, or elsewhere as appropriate. It may also be recorded as part of the Annual Review letter. A face-to-face meeting with the School Director is required for a complete annual review [Note: new university rule]

4.1 Procedures: Probationary Tenure Track Faculty

These procedures shall be consistent with Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 (C) as well as with Office of Academic Affairs policies described in the Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. Below is relevant material from the Faculty Rules regarding annual reviews for probationary faculty.

3335-47-03 Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty [C: 1, 2, and 3; and G only]

(C) Annual review of probationary faculty members.

(1) At the time of appointment, probationary faculty members shall be provided with all pertinent documents detailing tenure initiating unit, college, and university promotion and tenure policies and criteria. If these documents are revised during the probationary period, probationary faculty members shall be provided with copies of the revised documents.

(2) During a probationary period a faculty member shall be reviewed annually in accordance with this rule and with policies of the tenure initiating unit, college, and university. The annual review should encompass the faculty member's performance in teaching, in scholarship, and in service; as well as evidence of continuing development. The involvement of tenure initiating unit faculty in annual reviews is strongly encouraged. External evaluations of the faculty member's work, required for tenure and promotion reviews, may be obtained for any annual review if judged appropriate by the faculty review body or tenure initiating unit chair. The tenure initiating unit chair shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment, and in a timely fashion each year thereafter, when the annual review will take place and provide a copy of the office of academic affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date. At the completion of the review the tenure initiating unit chair shall provide the faculty member and the Dean of the college with a written assessment of the faculty member's performance and professional development. The assessment should include **both strengths and weaknesses, as appropriate**. If the Chair's recommendation is to reappoint the faculty member to another probationary year of service, that recommendation shall be final. A recommendation from the Chair to not

appoint the faculty member to another probationary year requires a review that follows fourth year review procedures (see paragraph (G) of this rule [below]) and the Dean shall make the final decision in the matter. All annual review letters to date shall become a part of a faculty member's dossier for subsequent annual reviews during the probationary period, including the review for promotion and tenure.

(3) The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the review for tenure and promotion at the tenure initiating unit and college levels with two exceptions: solicitation of external letters of evaluation may or may not be required by the tenure initiating unit and review by the college promotion and tenure committee shall be optional in all cases where both the tenure initiating unit and the Dean approve the renewal of the appointment. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the college. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the tenure initiating unit's recommendation, the Dean must consult with the college promotion and tenure committee.

(G) Probationary appointments may be terminated during any probationary year because of inadequate performance or inadequate professional development. At any time other than the fourth year review or mandatory review for tenure, a nonrenewal decision must be based on the results of a formal performance review conducted in accord with fourth year review procedures as set forth in paragraph (C) (3) of this rule. Notification of nonrenewal must be consistent with the standards of notice set forth in Rule 3335-47-08 of the Administrative Code.

During a probationary period, a faculty member shall be reviewed annually. For the first two years, the annual review should consider the contents of the appointment letter and scholarship plans as well as the annual reports. All annual reviews should entail the evaluation of the faculty's performance relative to the OAA components as outlined in Section 6, *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews*, of this Document. External **evaluations of the faculty member's work may be obtained for any annual review if judged** appropriate by the Personnel Committee or by the Director.

For all probationary faculty members, only one review per year is required. Thus, during the fourth-and sixth years, it may be sufficient to conduct a mandatory year review only (typically, during the Autumn quarter). However, if the faculty member can add information to his/her record for an annual review, which is based on the previous calendar year and includes the Autumn quarter during which the fourth-year review is conducted, then the faculty member should be allowed and encouraged to submit an addendum to the dossier, which is used for determining merit salary increases.

The Director shall inform probationary faculty members at the time of initial appointment and in a timely fashion each year thereafter when the annual review will take place and the Director will provide a copy of the Office of Academic Affairs dossier outline to be completed by the faculty member in reporting accomplishments to date.

The tenured faculty fully recognize the importance of creating a climate of support for non-tenured faculty and encourage non-tenured faculty colleagues to seek as well as to take advantage of opportunities for informal or formal collaboration and mentoring.

The annual review process for untenured faculty includes the following:

1) Each untenured faculty member will prepare an annual report, following the OAA guidelines for preparing dossiers. This report must be submitted fairly early in Spring Quarter (i.e., by the end of the first week of the quarter). A mandatory peer observation of classroom teaching shall be conducted each year prior to the 4th-year review and in the year prior to a mandatory review for tenure.

In order to provide the time needed to complete fourth-year review procedures by the end of Spring Quarter in the case of a nonrenewal **recommendation, the School's annual** review process needs to be completed fairly early in Spring Quarter.

2) The School Personnel Committee will conduct a review process of the annual report, vote on whether the appointment should be renewed, and prepare a report for the School Director, using the tripartite format of Teaching; Research, Creative or Other Scholarly Activities, and Service.

3) If the Personnel Committee recommends nonrenewal, the case should be put before the full eligible faculty for consideration. The review and decision of the full eligible School Faculty are documented in a written report and sent to the Director. A two-thirds (2/3rd) majority of eligible faculty present for the deliberation discussions who cast a vote must be in favor of the candidate for a positive recommendation to the School Director (i.e., the number of positive votes divided by the total number of positive, and negative votes must be greater than 66.66%). Per OOA rules, abstentions are excluded from the total number of votes on which the 2/3 majority is determined.

4) At the completion of the review, the Director shall provide the faculty member and **the College Dean with all written assessments of the faculty member's performance and** professional development and an indication as to whether the faculty member will be reappointed for an additional year. The faculty member may review her or his personnel file and may place in that file, within ten calendar days, a written response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file. The Director and/or the Personnel Committee (representing the School faculty) may also respond in writing, within **ten calendar days, to the faculty member's comments.** All responses shall also become part of the core dossier for subsequent annual reviews, including the sixth year review, during the probationary period. A meeting of the Director and the faculty member to discuss the report and evaluation is required if either requests such a meeting.

5) If the Director recommends nonrenewal of the appointment, the comments process will be invoked. On completion of the comments process, the report of the eligible faculty,

the Director's letter, and the comments will be forwarded to the College office for College Personnel Committee review and decision by the Dean of the College

6) If the Director believes that nonrenewal of the appointment should be considered after receiving a recommendation for renewal from the School Personnel Committee, the Director shall put the dossier before the full eligible faculty for review and recommendation. If the Director recommends nonrenewal, following a formal review by the full eligible faculty, the review shall proceed as described in (5) above. If the Director recommends renewal of the appointment, that decision is final.

If the Director removes himself or herself from the annual review of the candidate due to a conflict of interest, then the Associate Dean of Faculty in the College shall be involved in the annual review of untenured faculty. Any member of the Personnel Committee may also remove herself/himself from the evaluation process if a conflict of interest exists with the candidate under review. (See section 6.515 of this document for information regarding conflicts of interest).

Probationary faculty on Regional Campuses shall be reviewed annually by the Regional Campus Dean and by the School Personnel Committee and the Director on the Columbus campus. The Regional Campus review, which focuses mainly on teaching and service, should take place first. **The Regional campus Dean's and the Regional Personnel Committee report of that review and a copy of the faculty member's annual report will be** forwarded to the Director of T&L, the School Personnel Committee, and the Dean of the College. The recommendation resulting from the Personnel Committee Review shall be sent to the Director of Teaching and Learning and the Dean of the Regional Campus. It is important that the School Director of T&L and the Regional Campus Dean be alerted to any developing discrepancy for the probationary faculty member between the quality of teaching and service on the one hand and the quality of scholarly work on the other, in order to minimize the possibility that the Regional Campus and the School of T&L might eventually disagree on a tenure recommendation. When such discrepancies become apparent, the Regional Campus Dean should seek appropriate means of addressing this problem with the faculty member and the School of T&L.

If the Dean of the Regional Campus recommends nonrenewal of a probationary appointment, the case will automatically be reviewed by the full eligible faculty of the School rather than the School Personnel Committee. If the School Director recommends nonrenewal, the case shall proceed to the College for review by the College Personnel Committee and decision by the Dean of the College. If the School Director anticipates recommending reappointment when the Regional Campus Dean has recommended nonrenewal, the School Director should consult with the Regional Campus Dean prior to making the reappointment decision.

If the Dean of the Regional Campus recommends renewal of a probationary appointment, and the School Director recommends nonrenewal (following review by the full eligible faculty), the Dean of the College should consult with both the Regional Campus Dean and School Director before making a final decision.

4.11 Fourth-Year Review

The fourth year review of probationary faculty shall follow the same process as the Annual Review for tenure and promotion at the School/Regional Campus and College levels with the exception that solicitation of external letters of evaluation may or may not be required by the School of Teaching and Learning. Renewal of the appointment of a probationary assistant professor for the fifth year requires the approval of the Dean of the College. Before reaching a negative decision or a decision contrary to the decision of the School Director, the Dean must consult with the College Personnel Committee.

If the Dean of the Regional campus and the School Director disagree on a fourth-year renewal decision, the Dean will consult with both parties prior to making a final decision.

4.12 Exclusion from Probationary Period

Faculty Rule 3335-47-03 (D) (formerly 47-041) provides for time to be excluded from the probationary period for birth or adoption of a child, personal illness, care of sick or injured person or other factors beyond a faculty member's control that significantly interfered with productivity. Although individuals may apply for consideration of an exclusion at any time within the limits of the rule, the School may decide to consider during the annual review process whether to recommend application for an exclusion. The review of the requests for exclusion shall be conducted by the School Personnel Committee with a recommendation to be forwarded to the Director of the School. For Regional Campus faculty, the request must be reviewed by the Regional Campus Dean, Director of T&L, and by the School Personnel Committee. Disagreements shall be resolved by the Director of T&L and the Dean of the Regional Campus. If the Regional Campus Dean and the Director of T&L cannot agree on a recommendation, there should be consultation with the College Dean. The complete rule follows:

3335-47-03 Probationary service, duration of appointments for regular faculty

(D) Exclusion of time from probationary periods.

(1) An untenured regular faculty member may exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year to reflect the caregiving responsibilities associated with the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period for this reason must be made within the year following the birth or adoption and prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for the birth of a child or adoption of a child under age 6 is one year. Requests to

exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the chair of the tenure initiating unit for forwarding to the Dean and to the office of academic affairs. Such requests will be approved unless they are prohibited by paragraphs (D) (3) or (D) (4) of this rule.

(2) A probationary faculty member may apply to exclude time from the probationary period in increments of one year because of personal illness, care of a seriously ill or injured person, an unpaid leave of absence, or factors beyond the faculty member's control that hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful university faculty member, i.e., teaching, scholarship, or service. Requests to exclude time from the probationary period made under the terms of this paragraph must be submitted to the chair of the tenure initiating unit. Requests shall be reviewed by the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee which shall advise the tenure initiating unit chair regarding their appropriateness. Such requests require approval by the tenure initiating unit chair, Dean, and executive vice president and provost. A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any of these reasons must be made prior to the beginning of the year in which the mandatory review for tenure must occur. The extent to which the event leading to the request was beyond the faculty member's control, the extent to which it interfered with the faculty member's ability to be productive, and the faculty member's accomplishments up to the time of the request will be considered in the review of the request.

(3) A request to exclude time from the probationary period for any reason will not be granted after a nonrenewal notice has been issued nor will previously approved requests to exclude time from the probationary period in any way limit the university's right not to renew a probationary appointment.

(4) The maximum amount of time that can be excluded from the probationary period for any reason or combination of reasons is one year for an instructor, two years for assistant professor (including time spent as an instructor) and one year for an associate professor except in extraordinary circumstances. Exceptions require the approval of the tenure initiating unit chair, Dean, and executive vice president and provost.

(5) Faculty members will be reviewed annually during their probationary period regardless of whether time is excluded from that period for any of the above reasons unless their absence from campus during an excluded period makes conduct of such a review impractical

(6) For purposes of performance reviews of probationary faculty, the length of the probationary period is the actual number of years of employment at this university less any years of service excluded from the probationary period under the terms of this rule. Expectations for productivity during the probationary period cannot be increased as a consequence of exclusions of time granted under the terms of this rule.

4.2 Procedures: Tenured faculty

These review procedures shall be consistent with Office of Academic Affairs Policies and Procedures Handbook. A written annual review is required.

The Director of T&L is responsible for conducting the annual review of tenured faculty on the Columbus campus. The Director shall provide written feedback to every tenured faculty member regarding performance. In accordance with College and University **procedures, this 'review' letter shall contain an evaluation of the accomplishments for the** previous year (January to December) and shall be sent to the Faculty during Spring Quarter of the current academic year. After the salary recommendations have been approved by the College, the Director shall write a second letter, which states the salary **recommendation and provides a brief explanation for the recommendation.** The Director's statement shall include a reminder that according to Faculty Rule 3335-5-04, the faculty member may review her or his personnel file and may place in that file a written response to any evaluation, comment, or other material contained in the file. The Director may **respond in writing to the faculty's comments.** A meeting of the Director and the faculty member to discuss the report and evaluation is required if either requests such a meeting. Annual review processes should include specific attention to methods for encouraging Associate Professors to continue progress towards Full Professorship such as mentoring or providing research quarters (i.e., SRAs).

Within every five-year period, each tenured faculty member should include evidence of peer review, which may take the traditional form of a single peer observation of classroom teaching by colleagues of similar or higher ranks, and/or take the form of a review of student evaluations, course syllabus and other classroom materials and a combination of peer observation, analysis of student evaluations, and classroom materials (comprehensive review). Faculty conducting the peer observation will receive observation protocols and materials for documenting the observation. All faculty are required to submit SEIs for every regular course taught.

In case of Peer Review, (the latter required if a tenured faculty member is being evaluated for promotion or in the case of merit pay increases that highlight significant achievement and contribution to teaching), a faculty member of same or higher rank will be appointed by the Director to undertake, for example, to analyze and interpret open-ended student outcomes, or other forms of **written or visual documentation of a faculty member's** teaching. This analysis and interpretation by a peer, functions, in effect, as a member-check **of the faculty member's own stated perceptions and description of their teaching.** Although OAA requires that faculty not conduct their own analysis and interpretation of such material, it does not preclude a faculty member from responding to the analysis and interpretation by a peer. Additionally, faculty may wish to have the students provide a further form of validation of the analyses and interpretation of said data, thus providing triangulation. In all cases, however, if a faculty member wishes to have a qualitative analysis of open-ended written comments, he or she must formally request this of the Director prior to such evaluations being administered to students and administration of these evaluations must be conducted by someone other than the faculty member.

The annual reviews of tenured Regional Campus faculty are conducted by the Regional Campus Dean. The review letter is written after consultation with the Director of T&L. A copy of the **Regional Campus Dean's** letter should be sent to the Director of T&L. In addition, the faculty member, the Regional Campus Dean, and/or the Director of T&L may request a meeting to discuss the review or any other concerns.

5. MERIT SALARY INCREASES AND OTHER REWARDS

5.1 Criteria

The criteria for merit salary and increases must be consistent with those shown in *Reviews for Promotion and Tenure and for Promotion* (Section 6), and in accordance with College and University procedures. For example, an Assistant Professor should be expected to meet criteria that are consistent with eventual advancement to the rank of Associate Professor. In judging the extent to which a faculty member shall be awarded a merit salary increase, **the previous year's performance according to goals established by the Director in** consultation with the faculty member shall be of greatest priority, but consideration of the **past several years' performance and the individual's overall record may also be taken into** consideration. The quality of scholarly activities and scholarly products shall be taken into account when assessing performance for awarding merit salary increases. The Director will utilize **the School's Tools of Engagement for assessing teaching, research and service** each year.

5.2 Procedures

The ultimate decision on what merit salary increases are recommended to the Dean of the College for Columbus campus faculty rests with the Director of the School of T&L. The primary information upon which the merit decision shall be made is that provided by each faculty member in the annual review document, for probationary and tenured faculty members, respectively. Further information such as participating in and contributing to the program, mission, and on-going functions of the School, College, and University, and collaboration activities may be sought by the Director. If the faculty member wishes to point out some exceptional circumstances that are not covered in the main portion of the annual review document, he or she can put forth a written explanation.

In using professional judgment to assess each faculty member, the Director will consider the School mission together with the goals of each faculty member, and the nature of the faculty member's appointment as the faculty member's contributions and professional activities in the OAA areas are examined. To determine merit increases for each faculty member, the Director will be expected to recognize that differences will and should exist across the faculty and consideration should be given for the demands of different pursuits as well as the opportunity and resources they are afforded.

The Director should pursue equity adjustments based upon an assessment of whether a faculty member's salary falls below what might be considered an accepted range for faculty

with such seniority, professional contributions, rank, and qualifications. Faculty can initiate their own appeals for salary increases based upon equity by making a written request for such consideration to the Director. The Director may request that the faculty provide documentation to support such an appeal. The Director may dismiss the appeal or propose a resolution.

Per OAA guidelines for the Faculty Salary Equity Appeals Process, if the faculty member wishes to appeal the Director's decision, appeals can be forwarded to the College Faculty Salary Appeals Committee in accordance with University procedures.

Each of the Regional Campuses has its own salary allocation for distribution to its faculty. Regional Campus Deans have responsibility for recommending to the Provost increases for Regional Campus faculty. Each Regional Campus Dean will consult with the School Director of T&L before making these recommendations.

5.3 Documentation

All Faculty in the School of Teaching and Learning shall follow the promotion and tenure dossier outline prepared by the Office of Academic Affairs to record their performance for annual reviews and for salary determination (see Section 6, *Promotion and Tenure and Promotion Reviews*). It is essential for the faculty to record adequate documentation of performance in instruction; research, creative, or other scholarly activities; and service. The School shall establish a policy of denying merit increases to faculty who submit documentation that is insufficient to permit an informed evaluation of their performance. Additional detail on documentation of performance is provided in the following section on promotion and tenure.

6. PROMOTION AND TENURE AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (D): In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service, reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

6.1 Evaluation Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure

In developing the components and guidelines of evaluations, consideration has been given to standards which are expressed in the **College's guidelines, to the mission of the School of Teaching and Learning**, and to the full range of activities conducted by the diverse faculty across the three domains of Teaching; Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities; and Service. It is expected that the candidate for either Associate Professor with tenure or Full Professor shall demonstrate high quality performance across the designated OAA categories. Judgments of quality shall be made by the eligible faculty who will consider each case as presented by the Personnel Committee, who will consult with the Director and any other appropriate faculty member. Cases will be based on a thorough review of the **candidate's dossier; evaluations made by external reviewers, university students, and** where appropriate, members of the professional community. In essence, the evaluation of quality shall consider the expectations for a candidate at the particular stage of his/her academic career (i.e., pursuing Associate or Full Professor). Thus, high quality for a candidate pursuing Full Professor is perceived to be different (i.e., both quantitatively and qualitatively) from that of a candidate pursuing Associate Professor with tenure.

These new guidelines attempt to more broadly define quality in teaching; research, creative or other scholarly activities, and service, and to look for quality, relevance and impact as well as integration across these three endeavors. Relevance includes both timeliness and the need for the activity within and across local, national, and international constituencies. Quality is understood as thoroughness and articulation of the conceptual frameworks, which underlie the activity (see also number 2 below and Section 6.132 for a further definition of quality in relation to research, creative, or other scholarly activities). Impact refers to the influence on and interest to the various local, national, or international constituencies that are served by the activity.

These guidelines also provide opportunities for faculty to develop formative as well as summative evaluations, and encourage faculty to take a more active role in Annual Reports and Promotion and Tenure dossiers in describing their goals, their success toward achieving those goals through the inclusion of scholarship plans and reference to those **plans, and to represent their distinct professional identity as a member of the School's** diverse faculty.

Following is a summary of the guidelines of evaluation:

1. Teaching as a scholarly activity includes the pursuit of high quality, relevant teaching with impact in a variety of contexts, mentoring, and advisement of graduate students, the development of curricula and educational materials, and the generation of funding to support teaching. Candidates for full professor will be expected to have made significant contributions to teaching in the School and beyond in several of the 12 components of teaching and advising listed in 6.121.

2. Research, creative or other scholarly activities includes various forms of scholarly processes and that may include individual, and collaborative products that will be evaluated according to criteria such as attainment of scholarly goals; quality, impact and relevance of scholarly work. Quality, relevance, and impact are defined as: focused and sustained inquiry; publication in peer-reviewed journals and other selective outlets; leadership in collaboration; ethical and epistemological soundness; commitment to diversity and equity; integration of research, creative, or other scholarly activities with service; and, responsiveness to critical and consequential problems. A candidate for full professor is expected to have demonstrated that his or her scholarship has made a significant, high quality and coherent contribution, nationally or internationally, to social and/or educational problems and/or issues.

3. Service includes high quality, relevant service that impacts academic, professional and community organizations. Service within the university includes serving on committees, task forces, and student organizations, coordinating programs, and mentoring other faculty members. Service outside the university includes serving as officers, on editorial boards and task forces of professional associations, and serving the community through education-related and collaborative service and research projects. Candidates for full professor should have fully established a professional presence locally, nationally or internationally.

Each candidate's scholarship (i.e., scholarly activities and products) will be evaluated within the overall context of his or her work across the three OAA categories. With respect to scholarly productivity, the notions of quantity, quality and balance, are all considered in context so that diversity in academic profiles can be recognized in the evaluation process.

6.12 Teaching

Teaching is defined to include the pursuit of quality teaching methods and content in the courses offered by the School and in other instructional contexts as well as advisement of undergraduate, masters, and doctoral students by faculty of the School. Teaching involves not only sharing knowledge but transforming, extending, and generating it as well; that is, in the School of Teaching and Learning, we recognize that knowledge may not only be shared but also generated and acquired through teaching. Teaching should have impact on and relevance to those involved in the activity of teaching.

6.121 Components of Teaching

For purposes of promotion and tenure review, teaching may include, but is not limited to, the following components:

1. Teaching of university courses for credit and non-credit, on and off campus, or via electronic technology; including co-teaching arrangements, with a focus on interdisciplinary, cross-focus areas of study, cross-school, and cross-college collaborations.
2. Workshops/seminars sessions on and off campus

3. Supervision of students in practica and in supervised teaching and collaborative venues such as inclusive or co-teaching school settings.
4. Development of teaching materials (paper, video tapes, CDs, Web pages, etc.) to be used in on and/or off campus settings (e.g., in the University classroom or in the schools). This includes the development and refinement of syllabi and other materials related to courses and supervision settings.
5. Contributions to the development and refinement of programs and curricula within the School and College.
6. Published reviews or works that are designed primarily for University classrooms and other teaching settings. Products in this area may include monographs, manuals, how-to texts, educational materials for school-age children, reports for classroom teachers, and other documents of a similar nature.
7. Advisement and mentoring of undergraduate and graduate students and organizations; presentations to students at all education levels (outside of students in **candidate's classes**). Advisement may include conducting independent studies with students, overseeing research apprenticeships, mentoring graduate students who are not advisees, assisting students with publications and other forms of co-authoring where appropriate.
8. Involvement in graduate/professional exams, projects/theses/dissertations.
9. Consultation and/or collaborative activities with in-service teachers, including service on curriculum committees and guest-teaching in the school classroom.
10. The generating of external funding and/or other resources to support teaching.
11. The development of new teaching strategies and methods through the faculty member's direct involvement in K-12 classrooms as a teacher rather than a researcher.
12. The development of high quality teacher preparation or professional development programs with documented success.

6.122 General Evaluation Guidelines for Teaching

The School's evaluation of teaching quality rests on a comprehensive review of accomplishments in the components outlined in 6.121. To be evaluated favorably, an individual must contribute to the accomplishment of the mission of T&L in several of the components of teaching and provide evidence for the quality, relevance, and impact of his or her teaching. The individual should also describe the relationship between the three OAA domains in his/her dossier.

Evaluation of the candidate's teaching will include (1) annual reviews by the director, the School's faculty teaching committee, and/or personnel committee; (2) standardized evaluations by students (3) peer reviews, and (4) a candidate's self-assessments of progress. Evidence of quality of teaching is described in section 6.123.

(1) Annual reviews of the teaching of full-time regular untenured faculty by director, **School's faculty teaching committee**, and/or personnel committee.

Untenured Full-time Regular Faculty:

Members of the school's personnel committee shall review, through documentation (selected from 6.123) provided by the candidate, the effectiveness and quality of the **candidate's teaching** annually. Such review may include members of the Personnel Committee either conducting peer observations or requesting faculty (with the Director's approval) to undertake peer observations. This review may also include an analysis of the **candidate's student evaluations (SEIS) as well as additional evaluations of teaching that** have been approved by the Director, an analysis of teaching materials, course development, and record and performance of advising as appropriate and applicable. Faculty conducting the peer observation will receive observation protocols and materials for documenting the observation. **The director shall then review the personnel committee's evaluation of the candidate's teaching.**

(2) Standardized Evaluations by Students:

Faculty members of all ranks are to submit copies of the SEIs and a self-evaluation of teaching for the preceding calendar year in their annual reports.

(3) Peer Reviews of Teaching:

Faculty members of all ranks may request an informal or formal peer review of their teaching at any time. It is expected that tenured faculty request peer review of their teaching at least once every five years (see exception that follows regarding a candidate who anticipates proceeding to Full Professor within two or three years). In the case of an informal peer review, results of such review will not be made public unless the faculty member wishes to include it in his/her dossier. In the case of an associate professor who anticipates promotion to full professor within two or three years, that associate professor must request a formal peer review of teaching within that period. Peer review must also be requested by faculty wishing to have their teaching be weighted for merit pay increases.

Peer review for the purposes described in the preceding paragraph must be conducted by **the school's faculty personnel committee**. Again, if peer observations are part of the peer review of teaching, the personnel committee may request an eligible faculty member to undertake that observation on behalf of the School Director and personnel committee.

The faculty personnel committee will respond to requests to review documentation by either individual faculty members and/or by the director of the school in cases where other evidence suggests that teaching performance is not satisfactory.

Peer review may include (but is not limited to) evaluating a faculty member's teaching performance either through direct observation of teaching (preferably a representation of the range of teaching carried out by the faculty member for any given year), evaluation of **syllabi and other teaching and course materials, students' written** comments and SEIs, course website and other technology-based teaching materials. Faculty conducting the

peer observation will receive observation protocols and materials for documenting the observation.

(4) A candidate's self-assessments of progress:

Each candidate for promotion and tenure (to associate and full professor status) must provide a self-assessment of his or her teaching performance in his or her dossier. Each faculty member wishing to give greater weight to their teaching in any given year and to have this weighting be factored into merit pay increases, must similarly provide a self-assessment of teaching performance.

6.123 Evidence for the Evaluation of Teaching

The description of the evidence to be submitted corresponds to the various components of teaching. As much as possible, the Personnel Committee will interact with the candidate to develop a diverse profile of evidence of teaching excellence.

Evidence of teaching quality includes:

Formal and informal evaluations of teaching, including student evaluations of teaching (SEI) for each class taught by the candidate and representative student comments collected at the end of each quarter with the SEI or SET forms; written documentation of faculty participation if in a structured co-mentoring program; letters from faculty peers; statements of candidate's specific involvement in each course; course syllabi and lists of other teaching materials used, especially those created by the candidate; receipt of teaching awards; and course enrollment data.

Note: Contingent on the approval of this document by OAA, all candidates MUST provide the results of the (SEI), Student Evaluation of Instruction, for each class taught when appropriate. This does not preclude the inclusion of other types of student evaluation such as the SET or those developed by the faculty. These instruments may be looked at for evidence of improvement or impact of teaching over time, rather than simply as comparisons to other faculty. In essence, the presentation of results should follow the recommendations as discussed in current OAA guidelines for preparing the dossiers. Student evaluation instruments must be administered by someone other than the faculty member. Faculty members must notify the School Director of the use of additional evaluation instruments for any formal evaluation; such use must be approved by the Director and administered and analyzed by someone other than the faculty member who requests such instruments.

6.13 Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities

In the School of Teaching and Learning, and in the field of Education, scholarship is broadly defined. For example, Boyer (1990) describes four distinguishable and equally valuable types of intellectual activity: the scholarship of discovery, the scholarship of integration, the scholarship of application, and the scholarship of teaching. These forms of

intellectual activity are not mutually exclusive categories; they are distinct but related areas of endeavor that are mutually reinforcing.

The scholarship of discovery involves disciplined, investigative patterns of research for the purpose of the generation or discovery of new knowledge. The scholarship of integration involves work that interprets, draws together, and brings new insights to bear on original **research as well as the interpretation, fitting of one's own research**--or the research of others--into larger intellectual patterns. This form of scholarship might include interdisciplinary, collaborative, and integrative studies. The scholarship of application involves the application of research-based knowledge to critical and consequential problems in education and related fields in ways responsive to social issues and concerns. The scholarship of teaching involves not only sharing knowledge but transforming, extending, and generating it as well.

We embrace such broad views of scholarship (while not necessarily limiting ourselves to these definitions), and recognize that over the course of a career a faculty member may, and likely will, be engaged in more than one type of scholarship. A portion of a faculty **member's time will be spent in engaging in scholarship, and these activities must be fully documented in ways consistent with the pursuit.**

6.131 Components of Research, Creative or Other Scholarly Activities

Peer-reviewed scholarly reports and activities such as grants and other scholarly projects, both sole and co-authored, will continue to be considered an essential component of scholarship; however, the nature, function and outlets of scholarship will be broadened to more fully encompass the mission and core values of the School and College and to more genuinely reflect the integration of teaching; research, creative, or other scholarly activities; and service. In addition to peer-reviewed scholarly reports and journal articles, non-traditional forms of scholarship and projects are considered appropriate by the School of Teaching and Learning and by the College of Education and Human Ecology. Such publications and projects should also be fully documented in scholarship plans and annual reviews, as well as in dossiers for promotion and tenure.

For purposes of promotion and tenure review, the processes and products of scholarship are considered to be comprised of, but not limited to, the following components:

1. Scholarly books (other than edited volumes) and research monographs;
2. Chapters in edited scholarly books;
3. Edited scholarly books (indicate editing process);
4. Editorship of scholarly, refereed journals (indicate editing process);
5. Research bulletins, technical reports, and education reports (e.g., National Commissions);
6. Peer reviewed journal articles;
7. Editor reviewed journal articles;

8. Reviews, abstracts in journals and other venues, for example, encyclopedias (indicate review process);
9. Non-juried scholarly publications (newsletter articles, ERIC documents);
10. Papers in proceedings (indicate review process);
11. Unpublished scholarly presentations at conferences (indicate review process);
12. Submission of research proposals for outside funding and securing funding;
13. Creative work related to field, such as novels, essays, poetry, and other works for broader audiences;
14. The implementation of long-term research projects from which results will not be expected for a period of years;
15. Teacher as researcher activities within one's own university classroom or other teaching relationships;
16. The development of collaborative relationships inside and outside of the university and work within these relationships in which the faculty member may have a more facilitative role rather than an actual production role (e.g., writing that results from these relationships may not ultimately involve the faculty member as an author of a specific piece or pieces, but instead as editor of a collection, writer of an introduction to a collection, etc. For instance, faculty members may be instrumental in getting classroom teachers to write about the processes of teaching and learning);
17. The development of long term collaborative studies with schools and communities; interdisciplinary research and development projects; etc.;
18. The development and use of new technologies, including critical approaches to these technologies.

6.132 Evaluation of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities and Products

Research, Creative or Other Scholarly Activities should be evaluated for its quality, relevance to the educational community, and impact on the improvement of education as described in Section 6 above. Criteria of evaluation include: attainment of scholarly goals; creativity, coherent and sustained inquiry, commitment to diversity and equity; ethical and epistemological soundness; integration of scholarship, teaching, and service endeavors (e.g., the ways in which scholarship serves those involved in the research process; what various participants learn from the project); and responsiveness to critical and consequential problems. Among those items considered in the evaluation of scholarship may be the following (from the College of Education and Human Ecology Guidelines):

- Contributing to the definition or solution or relevant social problems or issues;
- Creating intervention programs that prevent, ameliorate, or remedy persistent negative outcomes for individuals or groups or optimize positive outcomes;
- Providing substantive contributions to public policy;
- Facilitating changes in organizations or institutions;
- Using expertise to help groups or organizations conceptualize and solve problems;
- Evaluating existing practices or programs;

- Integrating isolated or diverse knowledge to solve problems or create new theory;
- Testing theory by model-driven questions to add to cumulative knowledge concerning education phenomena;
- Interpreting knowledge in ways that effectively communicate it to relevant audiences;
- Securing grants to support any of the above activities.

6.133 Evidence for the Evaluation of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities and Products

It is expected that a significant number of publications are those published in refereed or juried outlets, especially refereed journals. The determination of quality, relevance, and impact in scholarship is obviously difficult and involves substantial judgment. The faculty members charged with this evaluation must synthesize information from a variety of sources, including: (a) their own analyses of key works of the candidate; (b) evaluations obtained from widely known and respected scholars knowledgeable of the candidate's field and research approach; and (c) knowledge of the quality of the journals or alternative outlets in which the works appear, it being assumed that the reputation of these outlets is determined by the quality of pieces appearing in them; as well as careful review of other sources that document quality, relevance, and impact of scholarly projects.

On all published works, the candidate is expected to indicate clearly the relationships among various writings, and the relationship of those writings to other intellectual work--teaching and service. Similarly, the candidate is expected to indicate the nature of contributions made to co-authored works and collaborative projects by providing per OAA stipulation, a brief written comment immediately following each listing of published works, and grant. The candidate may also include the amount (i.e., percentage) of the contributions. In such situations, the candidate is expected to show leadership in **collaborations through first authorship at least some of the time. The faculty's judgment** of such leadership is based upon a synthesis of all of the data provided by the candidate and external reviewers. The candidate is expected to provide evidence for the components listed in the scholarship area in 6.131. Possible examples of evidence include but are not limited to the following:

- self-evaluation;
- samples of published articles in scholarly specialty journals;
- review articles designed for experts in the candidate's scholarly field;
- books, chapters, and monographs designed for experts in the candidate's scholarly field; published and non-published abstracts of presentations to experts in the candidate's scholarly field;
- a list of funded and non-funded grant proposals to support scholarship and samples of those proposals;
- substantial, research-based reviews of scholarly works;

- letters of evaluation of scholarly competence from peers and collaborative partners; evidence of citations of the candidate's work in related publications;
- evidence of the extent of use of scholarly works; and,
- awards or prizes based on scholarship.

6.14 Service

Faculty members are expected by the university and the public-at-large to make their professional knowledge and skills available to the local community, state, nation, and world. In addition, as professionals committed to governance by peers, there are many internal activities that must be performed to maintain the operations of the institution. Thus, engagement in service on campus, to the community, as well as to academic and professional organizations is an important component of the faculty member's obligation.

Expectations for engagement with service to the institution and the profession both change **and increase as a faculty member's career advances. For promotion to Associate Professor**, expectations for service on and off campus are to engage in a balanced range of activities, **as described in the School's Tools of Engagement provided in the School's Pattern of Administration** and in doing so to have begun to establish an on-campus presence, and a local, state, regional, national or international presence.

For promotion to Full Professor, the expectation for service on and off-campus is to **continue to participate in the appropriate activities as described in the School's Tools of Engagement provided in the School's Pattern of Administration, and also to emphasize a balanced range of activities. Thus, a Full Professor's presence and leadership should be** fully established on-campus and off-campus. While balance in engagement and some national presence is important, a candidate may place his/her emphasis (local, state-wide, regional, national, or international) according to his/her interests. A faculty member whose work is primarily local, however, should be able to show that the results and impact of local work has been disseminated in ways that impact the field nationally or even internationally. Faculty are encouraged to represent their distinct professional identities as **a member of the School's diverse faculty.**

6.141 Components of Service

There are many types of service contributions. Quantity, quality, impact, and relevance of **service are considered. The School's Tools of Engagement for defining and assessing high, moderate, and low engagement across all domains by rank** will be used to negotiate faculty workload at the program, department or School, college, and university levels. **The School's Director will work toward balancing service load within and across programs.** The evaluation of service will be in alignment with these tools.

6.2 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Associate Professor with Tenure

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (C): The awarding of tenure and promotion to the rank of associate professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has achieved excellence as a teacher, as a scholar, and as one who provides effective service; and can be expected to continue a program of high quality teaching, scholarship, and service relevant to the mission of the academic unit(s) to which the faculty member is assigned and to the University.

Further, according to *Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (B): Tenure will not be awarded below the rank of associate professor*. This rule became effective for all faculty hired beginning Spring Quarter 1997.

Criteria for evaluating a candidate for promotion to associate professor with tenure has been outlined in section 6.1 in the summary of guidelines of evaluation and further elaborated in sections 6.122 and 6.132. Briefly, the candidate should have demonstrated quality, relevance, and impact in the areas of teaching, research, creative, or other scholarly activities, and service, and should be endorsed by a two-thirds majority of the faculty eligible to vote and, in fact, voting.

6.3 Criteria for Promotion to the Rank of Full Professor with Tenure

According to Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 (C): Promotion to the rank of professor must be based on convincing evidence that the faculty member has a sustained record of excellence in teaching has produced a significant body of scholarship that is recognized nationally or internationally; and has demonstrated leadership in service.

Criteria for evaluating a candidate for promotion to full professor has been outlined in section 6.1 in the summary of guidelines of evaluation and further elaborated in sections 6.122 (Evaluation of Teaching) and 6.132 (Evaluation of Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities). Briefly, the candidate should have demonstrated quality, relevance, and impact in the areas of teaching; research, creative, or other scholarly activities; and service. In addition, the candidate is expected to have made significant contributions to teaching, including published materials that enhance teaching beyond the institution, and excellence in graduate advising; the candidate is expected to have demonstrated that his or her scholarship has made a significant, high quality, and coherent contribution to social and/or educational problems or issues nationally or internationally; and the candidate should have fully established a professional presence locally, nationally or internationally. The candidate should be endorsed by a two-thirds majority of the faculty eligible to vote and, in fact, voting.

6.4 Criteria: Regional Campus Faculty

While the flexible guidelines for promotion and tenure and for promotion within the School of Teaching and Learning accommodate the different mission of the Regional

Campuses, it is important to reiterate that distinctiveness. The primary mission of the Regional Campuses is to provide high quality undergraduate and graduate teaching and to serve the academic needs of the communities. All faculty members in the School of Teaching and Learning are expected to establish a program of high quality scholarship. The School recognizes, however, that the quantity of scholarship of Regional campus faculty may be affected by unique expectations on those campuses including increased teaching load, varying work conditions, a high level of community involvement, and administrative demands

6.5 Procedures

The School's procedures for promotion and tenure reviews must be consistent with those set forth in Faculty Rule 3335-57-04 unless the School has the approval of both the Dean and the Provost to follow different procedures. Below is the portion of Faculty Rule 3335-47-04 that provides general information on review procedures and describes tenure initiating unit review procedures:

3335-47-04 Promotion and tenure review procedures.

(A) General considerations.

(1) In consultation with the rules committee or its designee, The Office of Academic Affairs shall develop and promulgate procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews to supplement chapter 6 of the rules of the university faculty. These guidelines shall include a dossier outline to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates to be reviewed for promotion and tenure and by all probationary faculty for annual reviews. The guidelines shall also include general information about the review process at the college and university level, information about any legal considerations affecting promotion and tenure evaluations, examples of criteria by which candidates for promotion and tenure are evaluated, and other information intended to assist academic units in carrying out reviews.

(2) All candidates for promotion and tenure are reviewed by the eligible faculty and by the chair of their tenure initiating unit. Candidates will also be reviewed at the college and university levels. The tenure initiating unit chair is responsible for informing the candidate in writing of the Provost's final decision (if negative) or recommendation to the board of trustees (if positive).

(3) The review for tenure during the final year of a probationary period is mandatory and must take place. A faculty member may ask to be considered for nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or for promotion review at any time; however, the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee may decline to put forth a faculty member for formal nonmandatory promotion and tenure review or promotion review if the candidate's accomplishments are judged not to warrant such review. The promotion and

tenure committee may not deny a tenured faculty member a formal review for promotion more than three consecutive years.

(4) Only the candidate may stop any review for promotion and tenure once external letters of evaluation have been sought. The candidate may withdraw from review at any stage of the process by so informing the tenure initiating unit chair in writing. If the review process has moved beyond the tenure initiating unit, the tenure initiating unit chair shall inform the Dean or the executive vice president and provost, as relevant, of the candidate's withdrawal. Withdrawal from the mandatory tenure review during the final probationary year means that tenure will not be granted.

(B) Review procedures at the tenure initiating unit level

(1) Each tenure initiating unit shall establish a mechanism such as a promotion and tenure committee, for presenting the case of a candidate for promotion and tenure to the eligible faculty for consideration and for preparing a report for the tenure initiating unit chair providing the eligible faculty's assessment of quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service. With the exception noted below, eligible faculty are tenured faculty of higher rank than the candidate excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the Dean and the associate Deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president. For tenure reviews of probationary professors, eligible faculty are tenured professors excluding the tenure initiating unit chair, the Dean and the associate Deans of the college, the executive vice president and provost, and the president.

(2) The candidate shall have primary responsibility for preparing, according to office of academic affairs guidelines, a dossier documenting his or her accomplishments.

(3) The tenure initiating unit chair or chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall be responsible for gathering internal evidence of the quality and effectiveness of teaching, quality and significance of scholarship, and quality and effectiveness of service from students and peers, as appropriate, within the tenure initiating unit. The tenure initiating unit chair or chair of the promotion and tenure committee shall also be responsible for obtaining letters from external evaluators and from other units at this university in which the candidate has appointment or substantial professional involvement, whether compensated or not. Some of the external evaluators should be suggested by the candidate and some by the department chair or promotion and tenure committee; no more than one-half of the letters contained in the final dossier should be from persons suggested by the candidate. All solicited letters that are received must be included in the dossier. Unsolicited letters of evaluation or letters of evaluation solicited by anyone other than the above authorized persons may not be included in the dossier.

(4) The eligible faculty shall review the candidate's dossier describing accomplishments in teaching, scholarship, and service and shall vote on the candidate. A report of the faculty assessment, including both strengths and weaknesses, and the numerical vote of the faculty shall be forwarded to the tenure initiating unit chair for inclusion in the dossier.

(5) The chair shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendation for the Dean for inclusion in the dossier. As soon as the faculty report and chair's letter have been completed, the candidate should be notified in writing of the completion of the tenure initiating unit review and of the availability of these reports. The candidate may request a copy of these reports. The candidate may provide the tenure initiating unit chair with written comments on the tenure initiating unit review for inclusion in the dossier within ten calendar days of notification of the completion of the review. The promotion and tenure committee and/or chair may provide written responses to the candidate's comments for inclusion in the dossier. Only one iteration of comments on the departmental level review is permitted.

(6) The tenure initiating unit chair shall forward the dossier with all internal and external evaluations, candidate comments on the tenure initiating unit review and promotion and tenure committee and/or chair responses to those comments, if any, to the Dean of the college.

6.51 Composition and Policy: T&L Personnel Committee

The procedures to be followed for these elections shall be determined by the School's Pattern of Administration.

6.512 Terms of Service

As stated in the School's Pattern of Administration, the Personnel Committee shall consist of seven faculty members elected for staggered two-year terms so that the majority of the committee members are of full professor rank. The Chair of the committee shall be a full professor serving the second year of his/her term, unless circumstances dictate otherwise (e.g., resignations, etc.). In such cases, the Chair shall be a full professor.

If an elected or an appointed committee member is unable to serve all or part of that member's term of office, an alternate member will be elected or appointed, respectively, to fill the vacancy. If an insufficient number of full professors, for example, preclude the replacement of an elected member by election of an alternate, the Director will fill that vacancy by appointment.

When candidates have joint appointments within the College, the single School which is the tenure-initiating unit for the candidate will be responsible for undertaking promotion and tenure procedures.

Note: Exceptions to the above are permitted due to reorganization or restructuring of the College; for example, the election of all new members of the committee may be necessary for the first year after reorganization.

6.513 Election of Committee Chairperson and Procedures Oversight Designee

At its first organizational meeting of the calendar year, the committee will elect its chairperson from among the full professors on the committee. The chairperson shall serve a one year term but may be reelected for subsequent terms. The chairperson will:

- a. convene all meetings
- b. remind the committee that deliberations are confidential
- c. provide a written agenda for all meetings
- d. keep a record of all minutes
- e. **inform the Director of the committee's activities**
- f. ensure that all communications with the candidates are in writing and that copies of these communications are submitted to the Director.

A Procedures Oversight Designee (POD) will also be elected by the committee at its initial meeting and serve a one-year term. The Designee should assure that the review body at each level follows written procedures governing its reviews, that the proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner, and, in particular, that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review. This person shall use the check list of information provided in the OAA document.

Note: From OAA Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline for the Promotion and Tenure or Promotion of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty:

The Procedures Oversight Designee should make reasonable efforts to assure that the review body at that level follows the written procedures governing its reviews and that its proceedings are carried out in a highly professional manner. The Designee should monitor the review process in regards to equitable treatment for women and minority candidates, including assuring that the proceedings are free of inappropriate comments or assumptions about members of underrepresented groups that could bias their review. If the Designee has concerns about a review, these concerns should be first brought to the attention of the person or review body generating the concerns. For example, if a dossier is not prepared correctly, the Designee should ask the candidate who prepared the dossier to make needed changes. If appropriate procedures are not being followed, those who are not following them should be promptly informed of the problem.

6.514 Quorum

A quorum for deliberations on matters involving appointment, reappointment, promotion, and/or tenure decisions for instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and full professors shall be two-thirds (2/3rds) of the eligible faculty.

6.515 Conflict of Interest

A faculty member should not participate in the review of a particular candidate, either as a member of the Personnel Committee or as a faculty member in the faculty voting process, when a conflict of interest is present. Such a conflict may exist when there is a familial or spousal relationship with the candidate or a close professional relationship such that the faculty member stands to gain or lose professionally from the outcome of the review. Open discussion and professional judgment is required in determining whether it is appropriate for a faculty member to not participate in a particular review. If two-thirds of the members of the Personnel Committee believe that a conflict of interest exists and the faculty member has not recused him/herself, the Committee will recommend to the Director that the individual be recused. If the Director concurs with the Personnel Committee recommendation, the Director will inform the faculty member that he/she may not participate in the voting process. If a member of the Personnel Committee decides to recuse himself or herself from a particular review, the Director shall appoint a replacement if required to complete a quorum for deliberations (see Section 6.514).

6.52 Mechanics of the Promotion and Tenure Process

6.521 Sources and Responsibility for Gathering Data

The promotion and/or tenure review materials will consist of two required parts. Unless otherwise stated, the candidate should use the first person in writing any of the materials in Book I, which contains the core dossier. Candidates must refer to the most recent edition of **the Office of Academic Affairs' Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline for the Promotion and Tenure or Promotion of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty**. Additional information for the sections of teaching, research, creative, or other scholarly activities, and service are also found in section 6 of this document.

6.521a Book One and Materials Preceding Book One

Book One (also referred to as the core dossier) will consist of the candidate's vital data. These data will be forwarded to the Office of Academic Affairs together with the recommendation for promotion and tenure. Book One must be assembled in individually labeled manila file folders. Materials must not be stapled or bound; notebooks should not be used for either originals or copies. Candidates may place sheets of colored or plain paper between sections of the dossier. Notebook dividers must not be used in the core dossier. Preceding the materials in the dossier should be the following:

1. A completed cover sheet entitled Record of Review for Promotion in Academic Rank/Tenure/Reappointment. The School Director should sign and indicate his/her actions on the cover sheet by marking either recommend or do not recommend.
2. The Director's evaluation and the School Faculty's letters of evaluation. The final **draft of the School Faculty's letter must include input from the School Faculty and the results of the Faculty vote.**
3. Letters of external reviewers. The School Director is responsible for making available to the unit's Personnel Committee all materials needed for a thorough review including outside letters of evaluation. The School Director requests outside letters of evaluation and internal letters of evaluation from internal units in which the candidate holds joint appointments. The letter to an outside evaluator must request a letter of evaluation, not a letter of support. Since the primary function of external letters is to provide an assessment of the candidate's research, scholarly, or creative work, the most useful letters result when evaluators are provided with representative examples of the candidate's work (when the work is in an easily transmittable form) and asked to respond to a set of questions regarding that work. The evaluator's opinions as to whether a candidate would be promoted or tenured at their own institutions or merit tenure or promotion at Ohio State do not inform the review process in useful ways. It is desirable that writers be asked explicitly not to offer such opinions. (For guidelines and examples of **how to state requests for external evaluations, see the most recent edition of OAA's Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline for the Promotion and Tenure or Promotion of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty**). Other external letters on teaching and/or service may also be solicited. The Chair of the Personnel Committee is responsible for requesting these letters. The procedures and time lines are **similar to those established for external reviews of the candidate's scholarship. Other types of 'external letters' are described in OAA's Guidelines and Procedures.** No internal or external letters of evaluation should be solicited by the candidate.

6.521b Book Two

Book Two contains items that will verify the information in the core dossier across the tripartite areas of teaching, research, creative, or other scholarly activities, and service. Book Two is mandatory and will be made available (upon request) to all levels in the promotion and/or tenure process.

Book Two is organized so that each item follows the same order as in Book One. Files for Book Two should be identified by the OAA number of the item and by the title listed in Book One.

Materials in Book Two document many but not all items listed under teaching, research, and service. Categories in which material must and/or may be provided are indicated in section 6.6 These include forms submitted for new courses, evidence of course revisions, evaluative data other than SEIS or other formal evaluations not initiated by the candidate

which must be provided in appendices A, B, and C, in the core dossier, collected on courses, awards for teaching, reprints of all publications and creative work listed in Book One, grants (include evidence proposals were submitted and funded or not funded), and other professional accomplishments such as documentation of prizes, awards, editorships, offices held in professional organizations.

6.521c Procurement of Letters of Evaluation

1. Solicited Letters of Evaluation Regarding Scholarship

- a. During early Winter Quarter prior to the academic year in which the candidate's dossier is to be formally evaluated, the School Personnel Committee will generate a list of potential evaluators who are recognized as experts in the field and who are not employed by OSU. The School of Teaching and Learning Personnel Committee will maintain a list of viable external reviewers suggested by the faculty and School Director and organized according to the expertise of the reviewer. This list can be consulted to generate names for external reviewers. The candidate will have the opportunity to review the names on the list and indicate any potential conflict of interest or other concerns that the candidate may have about the reviewer. The candidate may also add to this list of names proposed by the Personnel Committee. The list should include current addresses and telephone numbers, and facsimiles and electronic mail addresses, if possible. Outside evaluators must be in a position to comment in a discriminating way on the nominee's current research, creative work, or other professional accomplishments.
- b. The School Personnel Committee will finalize an ordered list of 11-18 evaluators to be contacted and submit the list to the School Director by early-March. Five to six solicited evaluators will be selected from this list by the School Director. University policy states that no more than one-half of the letters in the dossier should be from individuals suggested by the candidate. The School Director will share the list of names with the Dean who will approve the individuals to serve as external reviewers.
- c. By the end of March, the School Director will secure reviewers from the list. Reviewers will be specifically asked to evaluate the candidate's scholarship (not to provide a letter of support or recommendation). If appropriate, letters of scholarship also may contain statements regarding service and/or teaching.
- d. Packets consisting of a letter of request from the School Director, a vita, and up to five significant scholarly works will be sent to evaluators by early April. Reviewers will be asked to respond by mid-July.
- e. Letters of acknowledgment and appreciation will be sent to reviewers by the School director upon receipt of their letters of review.
- f. Copies of letters will be sent to the School Personnel Committee chairperson. The letters are to be placed in the candidate's dossier in the following order: (a) the cover page, (b) biographical statement, (c) internal evaluations, and (d) external evaluations along with a facsimile of the letter that was sent requesting the evaluations. If the letter does not indicate what materials were sent to the evaluator, provide such information separately. For each outside evaluator, the following information should be provided: (a) name, title, and institutional affiliation; (b) qualifications as an evaluator of the candidate; (c)

5. Joint Appointments

The Director of the unit in which the candidate holds a joint appointment will be asked to submit a letter of evaluation and documentation to the personnel committee of the home unit. The weight of this evaluation should be commensurate with the candidate's responsibility in the joint appointment. These letters should, however, evaluate the academic quality and effectiveness in each of the candidates defined areas of responsibility summarizing strengths and weaknesses, important accomplishments, and the value of significant contributions.

6.521d Preparation of Dossiers

In consultation with the rules committee or its designee, the Office of Academic Affairs develops and disseminates procedural guidelines for promotion and tenure reviews including the dossier outline to be used for the documentation of accomplishments by all candidates for promotion and tenure and by all probationary faculty for annual reviews. These guidelines also include information about legal considerations affecting promotion and tenure as well as university rules and guidelines concerning appeals of negative decisions. College of Education and Human Ecology faculty are required to follow these guidelines. The School Director is obligated to provide faculty with these guidelines each time they are revised. The School may create additional items within the three standard OAA categories of teaching; research, creative, or other scholarly activities; and service. These additions must be approved by the College and OAA.

The School Personnel Committee shall hold informational conferences with possible candidates during FALL Quarter, preceding the academic year for evaluation of promotion and/or tenure. As of the approval of this document, non-mandatory review faculty must self-identify no later than December 1 of the year prior to submitting documentation for promotion. At the conference, the Committee provides information and clarification on promotion, tenure, and tenure review procedures, consults on individual missions, and functions in such a manner as to facilitate the candidate's completion of the promotion, tenure, or tenure review process. At this time, the candidate furnishes the Committee with names of professional colleagues who might comment upon his/her contribution in a specific area of research, creative, or other scholarly activities, teaching, and service. The School Personnel Committee Tenure and Promotion workshop will be held at the end of **Fall Quarter in the calendar year prior to the candidate's submission of tenure and review documentation]**

By the last week of Spring Quarter prior to the academic year in which their dossiers are to be formally evaluated, each candidate submits his/her dossier (Book One and Book Two) to the School Personnel Committee for the POD review. By the end of the first full week of June, the Procedure Oversight Designee (POD) provides written feedback on Books One and Two and, if necessary, requests additional information, notes errors in format and identifies other irregularities in the dossier re APT requirements. The POD will then notify

each candidate if his/her dossier meets the specifications in the ED T&L APT document or if the dossier requires immediate revisions. Such candidates will have until the 3rd Friday of June to revise and resubmit their dossiers to the School Personnel Committee and School **Director's office. All candidate dossiers are, thus, due on the 3rd Friday of June.**

Deadlines for dossiers may vary across regional campuses. Therefore the POD works with candidates on regional campuses to ensure that their dossiers are completed by their regional campus deadline if it differs from September 1.

Ordinarily, candidates will not be allowed to remove from or add to material in the dossiers after this submission; internal evaluation documents generated during the review process may be added to dossiers by the Personnel Committee. In the event that significant new information comes to light after the dossiers have proceeded to the College review and left the tenure-initiating unit, OAA rules will apply.

If questions are raised about any aspect of the documentation of a case during the review process, it is appropriate and desirable for the Committee to seek answers to those questions during its review.

The Personnel Committee will meet in early Autumn Quarter to begin deliberations .

6.521e Submission of Dossiers according to T&L Promotion and Tenure Calendar for 2011 Calendar Year

During the 2011 Calendar transition year, all candidates who submit dossiers for tenure and promotion will submit final dossiers AND BOOK 2 to a designated Staff member on June 17. However, since the College P&T calendar will remain largely the same as for 2010 and preceding years, candidates will, until final 2011 submission date (Friday of the last week of August – in this case, August 27), be able to continue adding information pertaining to core dossiers and Book 2 (documentation) of Scholarly products (i.e., new publications, receipt of new grants, articles submitted at varying stages of formal review, notification that work has been approved to appear in press, recipient of awards, notification of new appointments (e.g., advisory or editorial boards, formal notification of appointments and/or service of various kinds) . In order to add such information or amend information in the dossier and/or Book 2, however, candidates must adhere to the following procedure:

- Notify in writing (via email), the PC Chair and Staff Associate affiliated with the Personnel Committee of such intent;
- Make an appointment with Staff Associate to add such information to the dossier

While in SA's office;

- Sign in and out with SA. SA to inform PC chair of any changes, record nature of the changes. No materials will leave the SA office during any changes made.
- No additional changes can be made to the core dossier or Book 2 after close-off date of last Friday in August (August 27 in 2011) unless requested by PC Chair and/or

POD prior to PC/POD and candidate dossier sign-offs on posted date in T&L calendar.

6.521f Responsibility for Recommendations

Candidate

Candidates for both mandatory and non-mandatory review are strongly urged to announce their candidacy by December 1st of the calendar year prior to academic year preceding their intention to proceed to review. The tenure and promotion workshop for intending and mandatory candidates will occur during the second week of December to allow faculty to commence compiling their dossiers prior to January of the year of review] The faculty in the School of Teaching and Learning recognize that Faculty Rule 3335-47-04 provides the opportunity for the tenure initiating unit promotion and tenure committee to "decline to put forth a faculty member for formal non-mandatory promotion and tenure **review or promotion review**". The faculty of The School of Teaching and Learning have elected to waive this opportunity so that no formal screening process will be instituted. All candidates for non-mandatory review may proceed with a full formal review in the Fall quarter as requested.

School Personnel Committee (Subcommittee)

The Personnel Committee, as a School subcommittee, will (1) collect data regarding each faculty member being considered for promotion or tenure; (2) analyze and evaluate data in accordance with college and academic unit policies and procedures; (3) present the **candidate's case to the faculty of the academic unit based on the results of the analysis and** evaluation of relative strengths of the candidate's level of performance and potential in areas of research, creative, or other scholarly activities, teaching, and service.

At any time during the review of the Candidate, the Personnel Committee may request additional information that would assist in a better evaluation of the Candidate.

School Faculty

Only tenured faculty holding rank higher than that of the candidate are eligible to **participate in the deliberation meeting to discuss the candidate's credentials, except that** tenured full professors will consider the tenure of full professors. Only faculty who participate in the deliberation meeting *in person or by teleconference* are eligible to vote on **promotion and/or tenure. Teleconference participation is outlined in the School's Pattern of Administration.** All participating faculty are expected to prepare for the deliberation **meeting by reviewing the candidates' dossier files and external review letters, which will** be posted on a secure Carmen site, for eligible faculty including those who are on leave or on regional campuses.

After presentation of the candidate's credentials and discussion, a secret ballot will be conducted to recommend or not recommend promotion and/or tenure. A quorum of two-thirds of eligible faculty is required to attend the deliberation meeting and vote on a

candidate for the voting results to be official. A two-thirds (2/3) majority of those present either physically and/or electronically at the deliberations and voting shall be required for a positive recommendation to the School Director. The vote is reviewed before the meeting is concluded. In the case where the faculty discussion and the vote are misaligned, the Personnel Chair will continue the meeting and call for continued discussion. The faculty recommendation and the case are to be incorporated in a written report prepared by the Personnel Committee on behalf of the faculty and forwarded to the School Director. **The report must indicate the faculty's actual vote and recommendation and an explanation of the recommendation, including the principal strengths and weaknesses of the case.** The vote and the case must show alignment. Per OAA rules, the Personnel Committee is not considered a voting body by itself (i.e., there is no separate vote taken by the Personnel Committee). Members of the Personnel Committee shall participate in the discussion and deliberation and vote as members of the School Faculty. Voting eligibility is determined by **the definition of Regular Faculty in the School's Pattern of Administration.**

All tenured faculty members in the school who hold rank equal to or higher than that for which the candidate is being considered shall vote by secret ballot (e.g., Professors shall vote on a recommendation for an associate professor seeking full professorship). The vote (number in support; number not in support :) shall be reported on a separate memo and reported to the college-level review committee.

Director

The Director is responsible for making available to the School Personnel Committee all materials needed for a thorough review, including internal and external letters of evaluation. The Director shall analyze and evaluate the case in accordance with academic unit policies and standards and the mission of the School. The Director shall articulate these standards and explain the candidate's performance in relation to these standards and in relation to his or her particular assignment. Such explanations are especially important for different parts of a joint appointment. The Director's letter must also indicate that the citations in the candidate's list of publications have been verified and by whom. Each recommendation must be supported by data and a summary of significant relative strengths and weaknesses of the candidate's level of performance and potential in assigned research, creative, or other scholarly activities, teaching, and service. The Director shall prepare a separate written assessment of the case and recommendations for the Dean for inclusion in the dossier.

6.521g Responsibility for Providing Feedback

School Director

The School Director will notify each candidate in writing of his/her recommendation and the recommendation of the School Faculty at least one calendar day prior to the date at which the evaluation letters need to be submitted to the College Personnel Committee for

review. The candidate will have 10 calendar days to comment, if necessary, on the recommendations. The School Director or Personnel Committee, representing the School Faculty, **will have 10 calendar days to respond to the candidate's comments.** In cases where the recommendations of the School Director and the School Faculty differ, the Director shall meet with the School Faculty to discuss the bases for these differing recommendations.

The communication to candidates must indicate explicitly the additional steps in the review process, for example, review by the college and university for recommendations by the Provost must be approved by the President and the Board of Trustees. When a final negative decision has been reached by the Provost, the Director must communicate the decision in writing to the candidate and refer the candidate to this document for information regarding the appeal process. The appeal process may not begin until a letter regarding the final negative decision is received by the candidate. If the negative decision also involves non-renewal of appointment, the Director must specify in that letter the candidate's termination date, namely June 30 of the following, academic year for both on-cycle and off-cycle faculty. June 30 will be the final working day for these persons, with a final payout effective on that day for both 9-month and twelve month faculty. The Director of T&L and, when appropriate, the Dean/Director of the Regional campus will be informed of the negative recommendation by the Provost through the Dean of the College.

6.53 Procedures for Regional Campus Faculty Members

The Dean-Director shall initiate a review by the Regional Campus faculty according to the procedures established on the campus. This review focuses mainly on teaching and service. The Regional Campus Dean forwards the report of this review, and a **recommendation to the School Director, for inclusion in the candidate's dossier and for the use of the School Personnel Committee.** From this point, the review follows the same course as all promotion and tenure reviews with two exceptions.

1. Following the review by the School of Teaching and Learning, the School Director shall send to the Regional Campus Dean copies of the peer evaluations, of the School **Personnel Committee's Report, and of the Director's recommendation.**
2. If the recommendation of the Regional Campus Dean and the School Director differ, the Dean of the College of Education and Human Ecology will consult with both before making a recommendation.

6.6 Documentation

Ordinarily, the School will follow the description of the documentation contained in the **guidelines by OAA (see OAA's Guidelines, Procedures, and Dossier Outline for the Promotion and Tenure or Promotion of Regular Faculty and for the Promotion of Regular Clinical and Auxiliary Faculty).** The Office of Academic Affairs Core Dossier (i.e., Book

One) outline serves as a basic standard for documentation, but the School is not limited to assessing the listed items only. Candidates are requested to utilize the additional items under the categories of teaching; research, creative, or other scholarly activities; and service as stated in Section 6 of this document. The information recorded in this part of the dossier is considered the Book One section. A description/summary of the documentation for each category follows (see Section 6 for further description of the categories and further required documentation).

Note: Faculty Rule 3335-47-02 Criteria for appointment, reappointment, and promotion and tenure

(D) **In evaluating the candidate's qualifications in teaching, scholarship, and service,** reasonable flexibility shall be exercised, balancing, where the case requires, heavier commitments and responsibilities in one area against lighter commitments and responsibilities in another. In addition, as the university now enters new fields of endeavor, including interdisciplinary endeavors, and places new emphases on its continuing activities, instances will arise in which the proper work of faculty members may depart from established academic patterns. In such cases care must be taken to apply the criteria with sufficient flexibility. In all instances superior intellectual attainment, in accordance with the criteria set forth in these rules, is an essential qualification for promotion to tenured positions. Clearly, insistence upon this standard for continuing members of the faculty is necessary for maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the university as an institution dedicated to the discovery and transmission of knowledge.

6.61 Documentation: Teaching

Student evaluations and faculty peer evaluations of the candidate's teaching are mandatory.

Peer evaluations should be detailed, should provide an analysis of the candidate's teaching skills, and should include evaluations of teaching materials, for example, course syllabi, examinations, readings lists, textbooks, as well as of the candidate's performance in the classroom.

Peer evaluations of classroom teaching are conducted each year during the probationary period through the annual review letter and through peer observations of classroom teaching. A peer observation of classroom teaching is conducted by the School Director or his/her designee from the School of Teaching and Learning each year prior to the 4th-year review. In addition, a member of Personnel Committee or appointed designee observes the **candidate's classroom teaching during the year prior to a mandatory review for tenure.** Candidates considering non-mandatory reviews are encouraged to request a teaching observation by a member of the Personnel Committee or appointed designee within 2-3 years before a formal review is conducted. Each observer will provide the Candidate with a letter of evaluation following a discussion with the Candidate about the observed teaching. Copies of the peer evaluation will also be provided to the School Director, and

the School Personnel Committee. Reports of observations should specify which courses were observed and at what point in the quarter the observations took place.

Reports of Student Evaluation of Instruction (SEI) data shall include both the number of evaluations submitted and the final enrollment in the class in question. An absence of evaluations for any classroom course requires explanation.

Further documentation of teaching (which may be included in Book 2) may include the following:

- Survey of students from the previous academic year conducted by phone by the **members of the Personnel Committee. Students' names may be obtained from class rosters and selected randomly for interviews;**
- Observations by the Office of Faculty and TA Development submitted by the candidates in the dossier;
- **Candidate's self**-evaluation of teaching including approach to and goals for teaching, self-assessment, and description of specific strategies for improvement.
- Assessment of the achievements of the candidate's former graduate students.

6.62 Documentation: Research, Creative, or Other Scholarly Activities

External evaluations of research, creative, or other scholarly activities are required.

Multiple approaches will be used to assess the quality and impact of the candidate's work.

Documentation may include the following:

- Measures of quality and impact of the candidate's publication outlets such as reviews **of the candidate's scholarship, or other formal recognition other than awards or prizes;**
- Internal evaluation of the candidate's work;
- **Evaluation of the candidate's scholarship plan;**
- Copies of supporting evidence submitted as part of the dossier will be reviewed by each committee member;
- For each candidate one committee member will be appointed to verify all citations for publications and all other information in this category;
- Candidates may be asked to provide specific information to assist in the assessment of the quality and impact of their publications.

6.63 Documentation: Service

Efforts will be made by the personnel committee to identify indicators of quality as well as quantity of service roles. Such indicators may include: evidence of service that is sought rather than volunteered; awards for service contributions, etc.

7. APPEALS

Faculty Rule 3335-47-05 (A) sets forth general criteria for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions. Further detail on appeals alleging improper evaluation is contained in Faculty Rule 3335-5-05.

3335-47-05 Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and appointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews.

(A) Appeals. It is the policy of the Ohio State University to make decisions regarding the renewal of probationary appointments and promotion and tenure in accordance with the standards, criteria, policies, and procedures stated in these rules, supplemented by additional written standards, criteria, policies, and procedures established by tenure initiating units and colleges. If a candidate believes that a nonrenewal decision or negative promotion and tenure decision has been made in violation of this policy and therefore alleges that it was made improperly, the candidate may appeal that decision. Procedures for appealing a decision based on an allegation of improper evaluation are described in rule 3335-5-05 of the Administrative Code.

8. SEVENTH YEAR REVIEWS

Faculty Rule 3335-47-05 (B) sets forth the conditions of and procedures for a seventh year review for a faculty member denied tenure as a result of a sixth year review. Upon receipt of the final letter of notification that promotion and tenure has been denied, the candidate may initiate these procedures. The text of the rule follows.

3335-47-05 Criteria and procedures for appeals of negative promotion and tenure decisions and appointment nonrenewals and for seventh year reviews.

(B) Seventh year reviews. Every effort should be made to consider new information about a candidate's performance before a final decision is made if the new information becomes available before a decision is tendered. In rare instances, a tenure initiating unit may petition the Dean to conduct a seventh year review for an assistant professor who has been denied promotion and tenure. Both the eligible faculty of the unit and the chair must approve proceeding with a petition for a seventh year review. The petition must provide documentation of substantial new information regarding the candidate's performance that is germane to the reasons for the original negative decision. Petitions for seventh year reviews must be initiated before the beginning of the last year of employment because the seventh year review, if approved, would take place during the regular university review cycle of the assistant professor's seventh and last year of employment,

If the Dean concurs with the tenure initiating unit's petition, the Dean shall in turn petition the Provost for permission to conduct a seventh year review. If the Provost approves the request, a new review will be conducted equivalent to the one that resulted in the nonrenewal of the appointment. The conduct of a seventh year review does not presume a positive outcome. In addition, should the new review result in a negative decision, the faculty member's last day of employment is that stated in the letter of nonrenewal issued following the original negative decision

A faculty member may not request a seventh year review, appeal the denial of a seventh year review petition initiated by his or her tenure initiating unit, or appeal a negative decision following a seventh year review, since the faculty member has already been notified that tenure has been denied at the conclusion of the sixth year review.